

REMARKS

Claims 1-17, 19-23, and 25-29, claims 18 and 24 are currently amended and claims 30 – 44 are new. Thus, claims 18, 24, 30-44 are pending and presented for examination.

Response to Claim Objections:

Applicant has canceled claim 16 making the objection to the claim moot.

Response to Rejections Under Section 103:

Claims 12, 16-18, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Goodman (US 6,904,457) in view of Fodor (US 2001/0032245). Claims 15 and 29 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Goodman in view of Fodor in further view of Salgado (US 2002/0067505) Claim 25 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being obvious over Goodman in view of Fodor in further view of Gaither (US 2003/0149620)

Applicant's invention is directed to a client/server model. One skilled in the art would recognize that a server provides a service via service software executed at the server. For example, a client may use a gateway service of a server being executed on the server in order to connect a call of the client between different network types such as connecting a call between a packet switched network and a circuit switched network.

In contrast, Goodman does not teach or suggest a client/server model. Goodman teaches that each node controls a particular function in the overall system rather than a singular controller performing all the functions (Goodman col. 1, lines 21-23). Goodman's distributed controller model merely distributes the functionality needed to control specific hardware. Furthermore, Goodman's firmware provides a functionality to control hardware assigned to the node and is not a service which is provided to a client. Simply providing a functionality if not the same as provided a service as would be understood by those skilled in the art. Thus, it would not be reasonable to consider Goodman's firmware as a service software. Therefore, Goodman in view of Fodor does not teach or suggest Applicant's claimed invention as recited in claims 18 and 30.

Furthermore, Applicant searches for the first service software since different nodes may provide different services. In contrast, Goodman does not teach or suggest to search to see which

node includes an identical service (identical functionality). Moreover, there is no need to search since Goodman teaches that the firmware provides all the instructions to all the nodes and ignores those functions specific to other nodes (Goodman col. 1, lines 61-66).

New Claims:

New claims further define the scope of the invention as described in the specification and drawings. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding the other claims, Applicant respectfully submits claims 30-44 are patentable and requests allowance of said claims.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the objections and rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are inapplicable to the present claims. Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims. Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this paper. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug. 25, 2010

By: Janet D. Hood
Janet D. Hood
Registration No. 61,142
(407) 736-4234

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830